

DOCKET NO: 199691US2PCT



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF:

TATSUMA OHKUBO, ET AL.

EXAMINER: JACK. T.M.

SERIAL NO.: 09/700,390

FILED: JULY 6, 2001

GROUP ART UNIT: 2133

FOR: INFORMATION SHARING SYSTEM

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

**RECEIVED**

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

**AUG 0 5 2004**

**Technology Center 2100**

SIR:

In response to the Restriction requirement of March 1, 2004, applicants elect, with traverse, the invention of Group I, Claims 1-10, 21-23, 61-63, 69-72, 96-100 and 104.

Applicants traverse the outstanding Restriction requirement on the grounds that it has not been established that it be an undue burden to examine each of the noted inventions and claims together.

Under M.P.E.P. § 803, an Restriction is not proper if a search and examination can be made without a serious burden on the Examiner, and the outstanding Restriction requirement has not established that examining each of the currently-pending claims together would result in an undue burden.


M.P.E.P. § 803 specifically states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

The outstanding Restriction requirement has not established that each of the claims could be examined without an undue burden, and thus each of the noted inventions and claims should be examined on their merits.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423  
Attorneys of Record



22850

Tel.: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413-2220

GJM/SNS/jrs

I:\ATTY\SNS\19's\199691\199691US-REST RESP DUE 080204.DOC